



King County

Citizens' Advisory Commission on Homeless Encampments

Commission Final Report

August 13, 2004

Contents

Section	Page
I: Executive Summary	3
• Introductory Statement	3
• Background	4
• Summary of CACHE Recommendations	6
II: Background Information: About CACHE	9
III: Review of Relevant Information & Public Hearings	12
• Input from King County Staff	12
• Input from King County Prosecuting Attorney	15
• Input from Public Hearings	15
• Other Public Input	18
IV: CACHE Core Principles: Areas of Consensus	20
V: CACHE Decisions & Recommendations	21
• Decision Area #1	22
• Decision Area #2	24
• Decision Area #3	25
Attachment 1: The CACHE Ordinance	31
Attachment 2: The Members of CACHE	34
Attachment 3: County Staff who Provided Support to CACHE	39
Attachment 4: Commissioner Role Call Votes on Decision Areas	40

I. Executive Summary

Introductory Statements

- *Homelessness is a national, regional and local problem that results in tragic consequences for individuals and communities*
- *Encampments are one piece of evidence of the failure of King County and the jurisdictions and communities within it to adequately address and end the problem of homelessness*

In establishing the context for sharing its work with the King County Council, the members of the Citizens' Advisory Commission on Homeless Encampments wish to highlight the two realities stated above that reflect consensus among all of the CACHE Commissioners. This consensus, based on the local data reviewed and the extensive public testimony provided to the CACHE, emerged during deliberations and is the core foundation for the report that follows.

CACHE does not identify these two realities casually. As empowered by the County Council to speak its collective mind, CACHE determined that it would be irresponsible to provide recommendations on homeless encampments without also issuing an indictment of the region's failure to adequately address homelessness. This failure is broad and far reaching: Despite millions of dollars from many sources spent annually on homelessness and despite the efforts of elected officials, government agencies, non-profit housing and service organizations, the faith-based community and private philanthropy, several thousand individuals remain homeless each night in our King County communities. This is an unacceptable reality.

The message CACHE wishes to convey is urgency. Although most of the CACHE Commissioners view homeless encampments as something that may be part of our collective lives in King County over the short term, tent cities offer no way out of the need to aggressively identify and pursue real, long-term solutions to homelessness. Those of us who return to the comforts of permanent homes each night must squarely confront the priorities of a society that permits homelessness to exist in the midst of one of the most affluent and capable nations on the planet. We can and must do better.

We would also challenge any in our community who would cast discussions of homelessness as an issue of "us" versus "them." People who are homeless are fundamentally no different from those of us who are, for the present, housed. In fact, we realize that any one of us could become homeless tomorrow, whether as a result of earthquake, fire, unemployment, domestic violence, mental illness, substance abuse or any of the other many factors that can contribute to homelessness. People who are

homeless are an integral part of our King County communities; in working to prevent and end homelessness, all of us are doing no less than creating a safety net on which any of us might someday depend for our own survival.

Background

The King County Citizens' Advisory Commission on Homeless Encampments (CACHE) was authorized on June 17, 2004 by action of the Metropolitan King County Council.¹ CACHE, which includes 22 appointed members, was impaneled to address four specific topics related to the complex and controversial issue of encampments of persons who are homeless in King County. These specific topics are:

- A. A needs assessment for homeless encampments, including an analysis of homeless shelters in King County and the date and time when demand for shelters have exceeded available space
- B. Policy and procedural guidelines for determining the location of future homeless encampments
- C. Options, including an analysis of the potential advantages and disadvantages, for locating homeless encampments on public land in King County
- D. Options, including an analysis of the potential advantages and disadvantages, for locating homeless encampments on private land in King County.

CACHE was given a very short timeframe for the completion of its mandate: Council instructed CACHE to deliver a final report no later than August 15, 2004. During two months of activity, CACHE collected a large amount of information on homelessness in King County, consulted with legal and human service experts, and convened seven meetings, including two public hearings.

CACHE represented the diverse communities of King County, and included members from the City of Seattle, the suburban city jurisdictions and unincorporated King County. The Commissioners brought to their work a broad range of social and political perspectives that often made for lively discussion. In submitting this report, CACHE wishes to communicate that despite its diverse composition, consensus was achieved on a number of core issues directly related to the presence of homeless encampments in King County. These consensus areas are:

- The scope of homelessness and its causes are large and complex
- There is not enough affordable housing that is accessible to people who are homeless in King County
- Shelter without needed treatment and supportive services is an insufficient response to homelessness
- Shelter should be a short-term stepping point to permanent housing
- Tent cities will not solve or end homelessness

¹ King County Ordinance 14922, June 17, 2004

The CACHE would like to emphasize its consensus that encampments do not offer a desirable long-term solution to homelessness. Homeless encampments are, at best, a short-term answer to the immediate crisis of individuals living on the streets, in the woods and elsewhere in our communities, and to the dangers and risks attendant to homelessness, including individual and public safety, access to essential services and employment and a sense of community and belonging.

In issuing its report and recommendations, CACHE would like to be as clear as possible that any decision regarding homeless encampments in King County should in no way be interpreted as letting all of our cities and any of our communities “off the hook” for the far more important task of creating the full range of safe, affordable, and accessible emergency, transitional and permanent housing linked to treatment and supportive services that must be the cornerstone of any meaningful response to homelessness.

CACHE was charged to complete its work in less than two months. As much as the Commission would have liked to develop a broad range of long-term solutions to homelessness, the timeframe in which it was instructed to work and the narrow scope of its mandate limited the scope of what CACHE was reasonably able to accomplish. The Commission was, however, briefed on the numerous initiatives related to homelessness that are underway in our region. These include the Corporation for Supportive Housing sponsored *Taking Health Care Home* Initiative, United Way’s *Out of the Rain* program, the emerging Committee to End Homelessness in King County’s *Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness*, the Washington State *Federal Policy Academy on Chronic Homelessness*, the Washington State *Partnership for Community Safety*, as well as a range of other more broadly focused initiatives addressing human services issues in general, such as the *King County Task Force on Regional Human Services*.

In reviewing all of these related initiatives, CACHE strongly encourages careful integration of the many efforts currently underway that are seeking to address homelessness in all of its forms. Such integration activities, which CACHE hopes will also incorporate the recommendations contained in this report, will be critical to avoiding a fragmented response to a critical regional issue that demands cooperation and collaboration across the many organizations, entities and jurisdictions that operate within King County. Our regional efforts must also, of necessity, be carefully meshed with related activities at the state and federal levels, from which so many of the resources available to our region originate.

Summary of CACHE Recommendations²

Given CACHE's unanimous indictment of King County and the jurisdictions and communities within it as a collective failure to address the problem of homelessness in our region, the CACHE offers the following recommendations on the specific topic areas assigned to CACHE by the Council mandate.

Decision Area 1 (CACHE Vote #1): Is there a need for homeless encampments?

Analysis of the data provided to and reviewed by CACHE suggests that on any given night in King County, as many as 3,400 individuals are without a regular and consistent roof over their heads.³ This is a deplorable condition for any community. The need for an adequate continuum of emergency, transitional and permanent housing is critical. With this perspective as its foundation, the Commission articulated the following positions:

Thirteen Commissioners voted that there is a need for homeless encampments at this time in King County. These Commissioners articulated three specific addenda to help to explicate their position:

1. A clear line in the sand must be drawn. A sunset date for phasing out encampments must be required, but only when there is no longer a need for encampments, based on the existence of an adequate continuum of emergency shelter and transitional and permanent affordable housing in King County.
2. Homeless encampments are needed at present because King County and its communities have failed to provide adequate responses to homelessness.
3. Careful management and oversight, size limits and service linkages must be critical components of approved encampments.

Four Commissioners voted against the statement that there is a need for homeless encampments at this time in King County, as qualified by the three addenda cited above. These Commissioners indicated that, with or without the three addenda, permitting encampments in King County legitimizes an unacceptable alternative for persons who are homeless and lets all of the residents of King County "off the hook" for finding and securing *more suitable and immediate* alternatives to homelessness.

² Of the 22 members of the CACHE, Council designated 18 as voting Commissioners and 4 as non-voting advisory Commissioners. Therefore, 18 votes is the total number of votes possible for any single decision. One Commissioner was unavailable for the meetings at which votes were tallied; this means that 17 is the actual maximum number of votes that could be recorded for each decision considered. A roll-call voting record for the 17 commissioners who voted on the different decisions approved by the CACHE is included with this report in Attachment 4.

³ See *The 2003 Annual One Night Count of People who are Homeless in King County, Washington*, prepared by the Seattle/King County Coalition for the Homeless, in cooperation with the King County Housing and Community Development Program, the Human Services Department of the City of Seattle and the Out of the Rain Initiative of the United Way of King County, March 2004.

CACHE wishes to clarify that the vote described here on the need for homeless encampments is not a reflection of whether or not King County and its cities and communities face a major challenge in relation to the problem of homelessness. CACHE is united in affirming that this is the case. Rather, the vote described here reflects the varied thinking on whether or not homeless encampments represent an acceptable and humane response to homelessness in our communities at this time.

Decision Area 2 (CACHE Vote #2): Should Encampments Be Permitted on Public or Private Lands?

This question proved complex and challenging for the Commission. Voting on this question produced the following perspectives:

Eleven Commissioners voted to support the use of public or private lands for homeless encampments. These Commissioners articulated one specific addendum in relation to the use of public lands:

1. Specific and consistent occupancy standards/criteria must be developed for encampments on public land (including health and safety criteria).

Three Commissioners voted to support the use of private lands only for homeless encampments.

Three Commissioners voted to not permit the use of either public or private lands for homeless encampments.

This particular voting configuration may be summarized as follows:

- *14 Commissioners support the use of private lands for homeless encampments, with three Commissioners supporting the use of private lands only*
- *11 Commissioners support the use of public or private lands for homeless encampments*
- *3 Commissioners do not support using either public or private lands*

Decision Area 3 (CACHE Votes #3-#17): What should be the policy and procedural guidelines for determining the location of future homeless encampments?

In order to frame discussion and decision-making on this topic area, the CACHE began its deliberations with the 2002 Consent Decree between the City of Seattle, SHARE/WHEEL and El Centro de la Raza related to homeless encampments. After careful consideration and discussion, the following guidelines were approved. The vote tallies for and against each item are provided below. Additional descriptive components for these guidelines can be found in the body of this report. Those guidelines that received the support of a majority of the Commissioners are included here; eight of the 12 guidelines received the unanimous support of the CACHE. The guidelines that were supported by a minority of the Commissioners are not provided in this executive summary but are included in the body of this report.

CACHE Votes 3-17:

3. Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must secure an agreement to host the encampment in writing from the host property owner. **VOTE: 17 yes/0 no**
4. For encampments on public lands, the agreement referenced above shall not be executed prior to formal opportunities for public input. **VOTE: 10 yes/7 no**
5. Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must promptly notify the appropriate local government department(s) responsible for land use of the agreement, including cities containing or contiguous to an encampment site.
VOTE: 17 yes/0 no
6. Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must notify the local community about the following specifics:
 - The date encampment will begin
 - The length of encampment
 - The maximum number of residents allowed
 - The host location (planned site of the encampment)
 - The date(s), time(s), and location(s) of community meeting(s) about the encampment**VOTE: 17 yes/0 no**
7. Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must provide notification to the local community within a specified number of days prior to the start of the encampment:
 - Require between 5-14 days advance notice: **4 votes**
 - Require between 14-30 days advance notice: **10 votes**
 - Require at least 30 days advance notice: **3 votes**
8. Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must conduct its notification activities in a specified geographic area in proximity to the site of the encampment:
 - Two (2) blocks: **10 votes**
 - 1,320 feet / 1/4 mile: **7 votes**

9. Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must conduct one to two informational meetings for the neighboring community to explain the proposal and respond to questions from local residents about the encampment. **VOTE: 17 yes/0 no**
10. Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must comply with limiting the maximum number of residents in any one encampment.
Allow a maximum of 100 persons per encampment: **9 votes**
Allow a maximum of 75 persons per encampment: **8 votes**
11. Any encampment must provide suitable buffers from surrounding properties.
VOTE: 17 yes/0 no
12. Any encampment must consider impacts to on and off-site parking. **VOTE: 17 yes/0 no**
13. Any encampment must consider impacts to personal and environmental health, and access to human services. Locations must be adequate for carrying out the directives and expectations of Public Health – Seattle & King County. **VOTE: 17 yes/0 no**
14. The duration of stay for each encampment must be compatible with climate-related location limitations. **VOTE: 17 yes/0 no**
15. The duration of an encampment at any specific location should not exceed three consecutive months at any one time, and not exceed six months in any two-year period. **VOTE: 14 yes/3 no**
(Note: All the Commissioners agreed that an exception could be made if the site is suitable, the impact of the encampment on the surrounding community is negligible, and/or the community is supportive of continuing the encampment.)
16. King County should identify and specify King County parcels that could potentially be used for homeless encampments. **VOTE: 11 yes/3 no**
17. Multiple encampments in unincorporated King County should be spaced no less than 25 miles apart from each other. **VOTE: 9 yes/6 no/2 abstaining**

II. Background Information: About CACHE

The King County Council created the CACHE in response to the extensive public dialogue related to homeless encampments that surfaced in King County communities in the spring and summer of 2004. Homeless encampments themselves are nothing new. They were present in communities throughout the nation (including King County) during the great depression of the last century. Over the past several years, as housing costs in our region have increased while economic conditions have worsened, local data suggests that the number of homeless persons in our region has increased steadily.

One of the responses to the crisis of increasing homelessness has been the emergence of homeless encampments or “tent cities.” The process of obtaining permission from a host

for a sponsored encampment site first began in July of 2000 with the hosting of “Tent City 3”. Prior to that time, two tent cities existed in King County without a sponsoring organization and host site agreement. These hosted, sponsored encampments take the form of short-term clusters of 80-100 individuals invited to pitch their tents on private, church-owned properties for periods of between 30 and 90 days. Tent cities have been hosted by various churches in Seattle, Shoreline, Burien and Tukwila and have relocated about 40 times through August of 2004.

Plans for use of King County public land for an encampment in the Bothell area led to a significant level of community concern about a range of issues related to homeless encampments, including how to best meet the needs of persons who are homeless and how to balance the site selection process for encampments with local concerns about community autonomy, public safety, quality of life and property values.

In response to these concerns, the King County Council passed Ordinance #14922, (see Attachment 1). This ordinance established CACHE and instructed that the commission “*shall study, identify options and make recommendations to the executive and council on the following issues:*”

- A. A needs assessment for homeless encampments, including an analysis of homeless shelters in King County and the date and time when demand for shelters have exceeded available space*
- B. Policy and procedural guidelines for determining the location of future homeless encampments*
- C. Options, including an analysis of the potential advantages and disadvantages, for locating homeless encampments on public land in King County*
- D. Options, including an analysis of the potential advantages and disadvantages, for locating homeless encampments on private land in King County”*

The Commission was further instructed “*to file with the clerk of the council, for distribution to all council members, a final written report by August 15, 2004, including a needs assessment and recommendations on the issues identified...(and) justification and reasoning supporting the conclusion.*”

The County Council defined the membership of the CACHE in the establishing ordinance, stating the Commission would be comprised of eighteen voting members and four non-voting, advisory members. The voting members include:

- Thirteen citizen members, representing each of the 13 Council districts
- Two members from community-based organizations, at least one from a city with a population of less than 500,000
- One representative from a municipal government in King County with a population of less than 500,000
- One representative from the City of Seattle
- One representative from King County.

The four advisory members include:

- One member from a human services organization that deals with homeless issues
- One member from a human services organization that deals with housing issues
- One member from the law enforcement community with experience working with homeless encampments
- One member who is employed by Public Health–Seattle & King County.

A full roster of the appointed CACHE members is included as Attachment 2 to this report. In fulfilling the Council's requirement that two Commissioners be selected to serve as CACHE Co-Chairs, Commissioners Holly Plackett and Bill Kirlin-Hackett were elected by their peers to serve in this capacity.

The County Council also instructed that King County staff be available to the Commission to provide staff support. The Commission wishes to thank the Department of Community and Human Services for ably fulfilling this function. Council also instructed other county departments, including the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, to be available to the Commission to answer specific questions related to its mandate. A list of the county staff that provided support to the Commission is provided in Attachment 3 to this report.

In addition to the staff support provided by King County, the county secured the services of an external consultant to function as Project Manager for CACHE, to facilitate the meetings of the Commission and to draft the CACHE report for review and approval by the Commission. David Wertheimer, M.S.W., M.Div., Principal of Kelly Point Partners (a King County-based consulting group), was selected for this position. Mr. Wertheimer brought to this role both an extensive knowledge of local and regional governments in King County and experience in addressing issues related to homelessness at the local, regional, state and national levels.

Between June 24 and August 9, 2004, CACHE convened five business meetings and two public hearings. At its first two meetings, CACHE received and reviewed information related to homelessness in King County and the history of homeless encampments from a variety of different sources, including the King County Department of Community and Human Services, the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office and representatives from the sponsors and residents of current tent cities.

The next two gatherings of the CACHE were convened as public hearings. Held on July 13 and July 19, these hearings were advertised extensively and open to any member of the public wishing to address the Commission on any of its mandated areas of inquiry. County staff also mobilized a CACHE Web site prior to the first meeting where members of the general public could review the activities of the Commission⁴. A comments page was created as part of the Web site to gather additional written input.

⁴ See <http://www.metrokc.gov/dchs/CACHE/>

The final three meetings of the CACHE were used by the Commissioners to review and discuss all of the input received and to deliberate on recommendations to be made to the Council.

III. Review of Relevant Information & Public Hearings

Staff Input: Data and Related Information Provided by County Human Services Staff

CACHE received several staff briefings on basic information related to homelessness and homeless encampments from the King County Department of Community and Human Services. The information provided was critical to understanding the nature and extent of homelessness in King County and determining whether or not there is a need for homeless encampments. Some of the key information and data about homelessness that was provided to the CACHE are summarized below.

There are, clearly, many different causes of homelessness in our communities. Some individuals and families become homeless for short periods of time as a result of fires and natural disasters; although many of us rarely think about it, the high risk of earthquakes, volcanic lahars and mudslides in our region means that large numbers of us could actually become homeless within a matter of seconds. Others may become homeless as a result of economic downturns that lead to loss of employment. Various types of family and domestic violence can result in homelessness among both adults and youth. Veterans are among the homeless population, many dealing with post traumatic stress disorder and other issues. For many of the men and women among our region's long-term homeless population, a variety of disabilities such as mental illness, substance use disorders, HIV/AIDS and other disabling conditions have been contributing factors to personal vulnerability, the loss of stable housing and the disintegration of family and community supports. For these individuals, stable and permanent housing paired with needed medical and/or psychiatric treatment, are equal necessities to ending homelessness. Our social service system, already stretched beyond its capacity to provide help to all who could benefit from assistance, faces particular challenges in engaging and treating individuals who are among our most fragile homeless and offering the intensity of services required to promote the housing and personal stability that leads to recovery.

Creating an accurate count of the precise number of individuals in King County who are homeless on any given night poses a significant set of challenges. Covering more than 2,100 square miles, King County includes Seattle, 39 other cities and large areas of unincorporated suburban and rural areas. The best available estimates concerning homelessness emerge from the annual "One Night Count" conducted each October by the Seattle/King County Coalition for the Homeless (SKCCH). This annual event does not attempt to count every homeless person in the county; the volunteers available for this activity are unable to comb the entire region and focus their efforts, instead, on the areas with the largest known concentrations of homeless persons.

The October 16, 2003 One Night Count reported the following results:

- 4,617 people counted utilizing emergency shelters and transitional programs throughout King County
- 1,899 people counted surviving outside without shelter on the streets of Seattle, Kent and parts of North King County
- 1,500 additional people estimated to be living unsheltered in the balance of King County not covered by the One Night Count.

Based on these numbers, the SKCCH currently estimates that on any given night there are 8,000 people who are homeless in King County.⁵ According to the reports from the SKCCH One Night Count volunteers, unsheltered individuals were found in many of the following locations: Benches, parking garages, vehicles, under roadways and bridges, doorways, city parks, greenbelts, bus stops, alleys, walking with no destination, and abandoned or inhabited structures.

In contrast to these numbers, the chart reproduced below provides statistics on the number of facility-based emergency shelter beds in King County that are routinely available throughout the calendar year.

**Total Bed Capacity for Facility-Based Emergency Shelter
In King County for Single Adults (2003 Data)⁶**

Facility-based Household Beds	Single Women	Single Men	Single Adults	Total Adult Shelter Beds
Seattle	278	942	388	1,608
North King County	0	0	0	0
East King County	5	30	0	35
South County	11	35	0	46
Subtotal of County (outside Seattle)	16	65	0	81
Grand Total	294	1,007	388	1,689

At the request of members of the CACHE, additional information was provided about the distribution of all facility-based emergency shelter beds (including family and youth shelter beds) in King County, together with information about the last permanent address of individuals utilizing these shelter resources. This information is provided in the following table.

Distribution of Facility Based Emergency Shelter Beds (all types) in King County

⁵ For further details, see *The 2003 Annual One Night Count of People who are Homeless in King County, Washington*, prepared by the Seattle/King County Coalition for the Homeless, in cooperation with the King County Housing and Community Development Program, the Human Services Department of the City of Seattle and the Out of the Rain Initiative of the United Way of King County, March 2004.

⁶ King County Department of Community and Human Services, background materials provided to CACHE

And Last Known Permanent Address for Sheltered Individuals⁷

Location	Single Adult	Family	Youth	Total Beds	Last Permanent Address
Seattle	95.2%	67%	61%	87%	52%
North/East	2.1%	14%	31%	5%	11%
South	2.7%	18%	8%	8%	14%
Wash. State					7%
Out of State					17%
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Analysis of this data provided useful information for the CACHE in its deliberations on the need for homeless encampments.

Given that emergency shelters in King County have reported operating at capacity in most recent surveys (CACHE heard about many shelters that must regularly turn away those seeking emergency assistance), the data provided by the One Night Count suggests that even when the 1,689 single adult shelter beds in King County are full, an additional 1,899 known individuals and an estimated 1,500 additional individuals can be found surviving without any type of housing or shelter on an average night in October. Assuming that surviving without any type of shelter is undesirable, the available data suggests that the accessible emergency shelter or affordable housing capacity for single adults in King County falls short of the need for such housing by approximately 3,399 beds.

The data also indicates that homelessness is a significant, countywide problem that is not limited to Seattle's urban core. Although 87% of the total emergency shelter beds of all types (single adult, family and youth) are located in the City of Seattle, only 52% of those individuals using these shelter beds reported Seattle as their last permanent address. A total of 13% of emergency shelter beds of all types are located outside the City of Seattle, while 24% of those seeking shelter list a non-Seattle, King County-based address as their last permanent home. While there are many possible ways to interpret this data, many professionals working in the area of homelessness suggest that the statistics are an indication of the pervasiveness of homelessness and that Seattle may be receiving a large number of referrals for emergency shelter from non-Seattle areas.

The absence of sufficient emergency shelter bed capacity in King County highlights one of the many dilemmas encountered by CACHE related to promoting solutions to homelessness. In an environment of limited housing and human services resources, there is a clear tension between the activities of building and operating more emergency shelters to immediately house those who are currently homeless, and significantly increasing the available stock of affordable permanent housing that is accessible to people who are currently homeless. In an ideal world, perhaps our communities would do both; when resources are limited, the choices become more complex and challenging.

⁷ King County Department of Community and Human Services, background materials provided to CACHE

Legal Input: Legal Perspectives Offered by the County Prosecuting Attorney's Office

CACHE received a formal briefing from representatives of the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, and an attorney from the Prosecutor's office was available at each CACHE meeting to provide legal perspectives and opinions as needed related to homeless encampments. Several critical legal perspectives provided by the Prosecuting Attorney's Office are summarized below.

Constitutional Issues⁸

- Religious institutions may, as part of their ministry, provide sanctuary for people who are homeless.
- Zoning regulations may not be used to *prevent* religious institutions from feeding or housing people who are homeless.
- Governments such as King County and individual cities may impose or implement a land use regulation on churches and other houses of worship providing shelter to the homeless.
- The regulation may not impose a substantial burden on the church's right to freely exercise its religion unless the government demonstrates that the regulation is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest.
- The regulation applied must be accomplished in the least restrictive manner necessary to further the compelling government interest.

Zoning Issues⁹

- King County zoning codes identify 11 different zoning/use options based on the three distinct land categories: Resource, Residential and Commercial/Industrial.
- Zoning codes are complex; for each zoning/use option, there are specific permitted land uses. Land use that lies outside of these permitted activities requires a conditional use, special use or temporary use permit.
- For homeless encampments on lands not zoned for this use, a temporary use permit must be requested and obtained. This permit can establish criteria for the encampment that must be met as terms of the permit.
- Zoning codes may require that specific health and safety conditions be met as part of providing homeless encampments.

Public input: What CACHE heard at Its Public Hearings

CACHE convened two hearings to receive input from the public about the topic areas assigned to the Commission by the King County Council. The first of these hearings was held in Tukwila on July 13, 2004. The second hearing was held in Bellevue on July 19,

⁸ See as a reference: 1st Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and Article 1, Section 11 of the Washington State Constitution. See also the Religious Land Use and Institutional Persons Act of 2000 (RLUIPA)

⁹ See King County Code 21A.08.050, pertaining to general services land uses

2004. Information about the hearings was widely disseminated via the CACHE Web site, the local print and electronic media, and word of mouth. Specific invitations were issued to representatives of municipal governmental authorities for each incorporated area in King County.

Those offering testimony to CACHE represented a diverse range of individuals, including past and current residents of homeless encampments, ordained clergy, members of community-based organizations and private citizens. The perspectives offered to the Commission were equally diverse in content. However, for the most part, those testifying were from two distinct groups of individuals who experience the most immediate impacts of homeless encampments: Residents of tent cities and those providing assistance to them, and individual property owners living in close proximity to a current encampment. The CACHE received comparatively little testimony from the residents of the many communities in which encampments have been hosted in years past.

Although representatives of local municipal governments received a separate invitation to provide input during the CACHE public hearings, no representatives from this group of stakeholders offered comments to the Commission at its public hearings. This absence was disturbing to many Commissioners as it suggests that there is an insufficient level of concern from and involvement by municipal governments in the issue of homelessness. Despite this absence, CACHE believes that homelessness remains a local, regional and national issue and that the solutions to homelessness must be developed and implemented in every King County community.

A summary of some of the key perspectives offered by those testifying before the Commission is provided below.

On the Need for Homeless Encampments

- Forty-five individuals testified that there is a need for encampments.
- Thirteen individuals testified that there either was not a need for tent cities, or that homeless encampments are a bad idea.
- Thirty individuals articulated the need for permanent solutions to homeless that address the root causes of homelessness.

On the Use of Public or Private Lands for Encampments

- Fourteen individuals testified that homeless encampments should be permitted on public lands. Of these 14 individuals, 11 indicated that their preference for tent cities on public lands was related to the ability of publicly hosted sites to allow longer lengths of stay for an encampment. The longer length of stay, these individuals stated, helps residents to establish and sustain the stability required to get and keep jobs.
- Seven individuals testified that homeless encampments should be limited to private lands.

- Ten individuals testified that homeless encampments should be permitted on both public and private lands.
- Seven individuals testified that homeless encampments should not be permitted on either public or private lands.

On the Value of Homeless Encampments

- Seventeen individuals who were current or former residents of homeless encampments indicated that the encampment experience has or is helping them stabilize their lives and access the employment and social services that will increase their abilities to access and sustain independent housing. Many of these individuals reported that, for them, tent cities had served as an entry point to the process of recovering from homelessness.
- Fifteen individuals cited increased personal safety and security as one of the primary purposes of homeless encampments; living in the tent city provides more safety than living on the streets.
- Five individuals indicated that tent cities provided an alternative to gender-separated shelter settings for homeless couples.
- Two individuals testified that homeless encampments helped pregnant women access pre-natal care.
- Four individuals indicated that homeless encampments provide space for storage of personal belongings that is not available in shelters.
- Nine individuals testified that homeless encampments provide a sense of community for persons who are homeless.
- Seven individuals living near homeless encampments indicated that encampments were an asset to their neighborhood, and enriched the life of the community.

On the Negative Impact of Homeless Encampments

- Two individuals testified that from their perspective, tent cities had disrupted their neighborhood and caused local property owners financial injury.
- Five individuals suggested that homeless encampments contribute to and enable homelessness.
- Three individuals testified that they believe tent cities make the region a magnet for persons who are homeless.
- Two individuals testified that tent cities increase stresses on local government resources, including law enforcement.
- One person testified that tent cities further stigmatize the homeless.

On Alternatives to Homeless Encampments

- Two individuals suggested that a local tax be instituted to fund permanent solutions to homelessness.
- Two individuals suggested promoting home-sharing opportunities for persons who are homeless.

Other Input: What CACHE Learned from Written Submissions

In addition to the CACHE hearings, members of the public were invited to submit written testimony to the Commission, using either the CACHE Web site or the United States Postal Service. Submissions received represented a broad array of perspectives and opinions on the issue of homeless encampments. The CACHE Commissioners were impressed by the depth, thoughtfulness and passion reflected in many of these submissions. Those who communicated with the Commission clearly care deeply about the wellbeing of their communities and the quality of life in King County, both for persons who are homeless and those who are fortunate enough to have permanent addresses. A range of concerns was expressed about the needs of people who are homeless, the impact of encampments on both small and large communities and the appropriateness of placing encampments on either public or private lands. The Commission thanks those who contributed for the richness of their submissions.

Although it is impossible to summarize fully the contents of all of the materials delivered to CACHE for consideration, two samples from the submissions help to convey the breath of positions articulated by King County citizens:

“I disagree totally with the idea that we need Tent Cities and further, they do not provide a valid progressive and positive useful service. In conjunction with this I see no need or requirement for Tent Cities or the like to be located on public property....As for the use of private or church property this is up to those others who would offer their land for such use. However, they must follow “Due Process” which involves obeying existing and future ordinances, statues and other public reviews that cover this type of land use. They must also be responsible for expenses that require public support including public health and safety...”

-- A resident of Bothell WA, July 19, 2004

“In May of this year, T[ent] C[ity] 3 was located 50 steps from my front door. At first I was reticent, but after the first 24 hours I was convinced that it was the BEST thing that had happened to my neighborhood in a decade! I wish the tent city could have stayed longer! I own a half-million dollar home, and I was fearful that this encampment would devalue my home...it did not. The people living in TC3 were courteous, thoughtful, security minded, and even picked up the trash within a two-block radius of the camp! The curfews they set, along with the security they self-provided were strictly enforced. It was NOT a steady flow of people coming and going. The security gate and check point were maintained 24/7.”

-- A resident of Seattle WA, July 10, 2004

CACHE also solicited input from local government and law enforcement officials in communities where encampments had been hosted. Questions were asked related to additional expenses incurred by public service systems as well as public safety problems

that might have been related to the presence of the encampments. The following information was collected as part of the CACHE process:

- According to a detailed report in the *Seattle Times* about Tent City 3 and its movement through a range of Seattle neighborhoods, “...residents, police and crime statistics suggest that the homeless encampment has not created a crime wave anywhere it has gone.”¹⁰
- Forrest Conover, Chief of Police for the City of Bothell, provided a detailed memorandum related to police activities related to the homeless encampment within his jurisdiction. Detailing on results of the 24-hour police presence at the encampment between May 17 and July 6, 2004, he wrote that a total of 83 police contacts were reported. This included 18 criminal investigations and 65 non-criminal investigations. Chief Conover went on to note: “...the amount of police activity has been fairly significant for the first fifty-one days of the encampment. However, we must also say that many of these reports have been documented ‘contacts’ by officers working security at Tent City, not criminal activity. In addition, many of these reports have been generated by Tent City ‘security’ after calling the police department to advise that someone had been ‘ejected’ or ‘rejected’.” He went on to state that “I believe the reason most other jurisdictions which have hosted a tent city did not have a similar number of police incidents is largely due to the fact that they did not have a police officer stationed at the encampment, and/or police were not notified often when tent city residents were required to leave the encampment.” Bothell Police identified 11 individuals at the tent city with outstanding arrest warrants, two individuals with records as violent offenders and one known level-two sex offender. Overall, Chief Conover noted that “Most of the individuals at tent city are law-abiding, and we have not seen an increase in crime in the Mayville neighborhood.”¹¹
- Chief Keith Haines of the City of Tukwila Police Department provided the following information to CACHE: “We did not have significant police costs that we incurred the several times that Tent City was here in Tukwila. We had a few minor police calls, but nothing out of the ordinary. We did not post a guard there 24 hours a day because it was not necessary here.”¹²
- Chris Flores, Operations Chief for the Tukwila Fire Department, provided the following additional information from Tukwila: “Tent City [in Tukwila] did not generate inordinate expenses nor did it significantly impact our call volume.”¹³

¹⁰ Seattle Times, *Tent City Doesn't Seem to Affect Crime Rates*, by Keith Ervin and Justin Mayo, May 21, 2004

¹¹ City of Bothell Interoffice Memorandum from Forrest Conover, Chief of Police, to Manny Ocampo, Interim City Manager, dated July 8, 2004

¹² Email from Keith Haines to Sherry Hamilton, King County DCHS, July 23, 2004

¹³ Email from Chris Flores to Sherry Hamilton, King County DCHS, July 22, 2004

IV. CACHE Core Principles: Areas of Consensus

Every member of CACHE was committed to working to find viable solutions to the urgent problem of homelessness in King County. However, early on in its deliberations, CACHE members recognized that consensus would be difficult to achieve on all of the specific topic areas assigned to it by the Council. In order to provide a foundation upon which the Commission could pursue the complex and challenging issues related to homeless encampments, the group decided to search for common principles with which all members could agree and upon which the CACHE deliberations could be constructed. Five such common principles were identified:

- **The scope of homelessness and its causes are large and complex.** CACHE recognized that seven meetings and two months of activities would not create a solution to homelessness, and that numerous other local and regional initiatives are working to address this issue. Precisely because of the scale of the problem of homelessness currently confronting our communities, the Commission recognized that tackling the many core issues that cause homelessness will require active partnership among every concerned citizen and stakeholder in the county. The Commission strongly encourages King County communities, led by the King County Council and the County Executive, not to shy away from the tasks and collaborations that ending homelessness will require.
- **There is not enough affordable housing that is accessible to the homeless in King County.** There is not currently enough affordable housing in King County to end homelessness in our communities. This is particularly true of housing for those of our residents in the very lowest income categories. For a person receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) from the Social Security Administration, unless housing is significantly subsidized, it remains virtually out of reach.¹⁴ Even a working couple, each earning \$7.50 per hour, cannot afford the average rent for one-bedroom apartment in King County.¹⁵ Additionally, while the rental housing market in our region may have “softened” in recent years, persons with histories of homelessness often have trouble accessing affordable housing that may be available. The lack of affordable housing, along with unemployment, bad credit, histories of criminal justice system involvement, move-in costs (including first and last month rent, damage deposits), a broad range of physical and mental disabilities, etc., all make existing housing stock difficult to secure for many persons who are homeless, without even considering the increasing shortage of subsidized housing resources and the long waiting lists for such programs. Waiting lists for Section 8 housing vouchers run many months to several years, and these already unreasonable waiting lists will be

¹⁴ In 2003, the average monthly rent for a 1-bedroom apartment in the Seattle-Bellevue area was 124.4% of amount of an individual SSI monthly payment. For additional details, see http://www.wpas-rights.org/Envoy%20Online/Envoy%20Archives/Priced_Out_of_Housing.htm

¹⁵ United Way of King County, Out of the Rain Initiative

further exacerbated by anticipated decreases in the availability of Section 8 subsidies in the years ahead.

- **Shelter without needed treatment is an insufficient response to homelessness.** For many persons who are struggling with both homelessness and mental illness, substance use disorders and other disabling conditions, housing in and of itself is not a viable answer to homelessness. For these individuals, without the needed array of essential treatment and supportive services, housing tenure will be short-lived and the risk increases of returning to homelessness. Treatment services must be linked to housing in a fashion that supports individuals in obtaining and maintaining housing.
- **Shelter should be a short-term stepping point to permanent housing.** Emergency housing solutions, such as shelters, should never be considered an adequate response to homelessness. Emergency housing should always be conceptualized as the entry point to a continuum of housing alternatives linked to any needed treatment and supportive services. Providing shelter alone is insufficient, if our goal is truly ending homelessness.
- **Tent cities will not solve or end homelessness.** Encampments should be considered one of the least desirable emergency housing alternatives. Although some individuals find safety, stability and community in the tent city environment, our society should be able to do better than parking people in encampments. The solution to homelessness is housing and supportive services, not more tent cities.

V. CACHE Decisions & Recommendations

Building upon the consensus foundation of the five core principles identified above, the CACHE addressed the specific topic areas assigned to it by the County Council. The decisions made by the voting members of the CACHE are detailed and discussed below. For each decision, where consensus was not achieved, majority and minority positions are clearly articulated, along with the rationale for each of the positions taken. A roll-call vote recording the actual votes of each Commissioner on each decision area is included in Attachment 4 to this report.

Decision Area 1: Is there a need for homeless encampments?

Analysis of the available data suggests that on any given night in King County, almost 3,400 individuals are without a roof over the heads. This is a deplorable condition for any community. With only limited emergency and transitional beds available in our King County communities that are all operating at or near their capacities, there is a significant

gap between the need for emergency and transitional housing and the abilities of our communities to fill this need. Clearly, the need for an adequate continuum of emergency, transitional and permanent housing is critical.

Pivotal issues considered by the Commission included:

- In the absence of sufficient emergency and transitional housing, do homeless encampments provide a viable alternative for individuals who would otherwise be living in isolated pockets on the streets, under viaducts, in the woods and in other locations throughout King County?
- Do homeless encampments meet the basic definition of dignified shelter?
- Do homeless encampments have significant and lasting negative impacts on the communities that host them?
- Would any statement from King County endorsing the use of homeless encampments distract our communities from the more important task of generating the resources and the will to end homelessness?

After discussion of these and other core issues, the Commission articulated the following positions:

Thirteen Commissioners voted that there is a need for homeless encampments at this time in King County. This perspective is rooted in the belief that the problem of homelessness cannot be solved overnight, and that tomorrow there will still be large numbers of persons who are homeless in King County who could benefit from the relative safety, stability and community environment provided by encampments. The 10 Commissioners supporting this position articulated three specific addenda to help to explicate their position:

1. A clear line in the sand must be drawn. A sunset date for phasing out encampments must be required, but only when there is no longer a need for encampments based on the existence of an adequate continuum of emergency shelter and transitional and permanent housing in King County.
2. Homeless encampments are needed at present because King County and its communities have failed to provide adequate responses to homelessness.
3. Careful management and oversight, size limits and service linkages must be critical components of approved encampments.

These three addenda were intended to clarify that support of homeless encampments must in no way detract our communities from applying all available skill, energy and resources to solving the problem of homelessness in King County. The “sunset date” clause is not provided to suggest that after a certain date, people who are homeless should be forced out of encampments and back onto the street. ***Rather, requiring a “sunset date” is intended to help to stimulate the immediate response needed to ensure that by a yet to be determined date, homeless encampments will no longer be needed because an adequate supply of emergency shelter, transitional housing and affordable permanent housing has been developed.***

The second addenda is intended to underscore that solving the problem of homelessness is a responsibility shared by all of us and each of our communities. Homelessness is not a “Seattle problem;” there are people who are homeless in virtually every King County community. Nor can we only blame the residents of encampments for their predicaments; the failure of an adequate response sits squarely and collectively on all of our shoulders.

The third addenda is provided to ensure that homeless encampments remain manageable entities, limited in size and linked to the treatment and services that residents may need. Encampments without connections to transportation that can help residents get to jobs and other appointments will not help to promote an end to homelessness. Tent cities with residents that have unmet treatment needs related to major illnesses and disabilities will not provide healthy environments that promote recovery.

Four Commissioners voted against the statement that there is a need for homeless encampments at this time in King County, as qualified in the 3 addenda cited above. These Commissioners indicated that permitting encampments in King County legitimizes an unacceptable alternative for persons who are homeless and lets King County communities “off the hook” for finding and securing *more suitable and immediate* alternatives to homelessness.

The four Commissioners cited above did not vote against encampments because they did not accept the data confirming that the need for emergency, transitional and permanent housing capacity in King County far outstrips available capacity in these systems. Rather, this group articulated the concern that by permitting encampments, our communities will tacitly approve of a response to homelessness that is less than what we need to be doing to actually end homelessness. People encamped are still people homeless. Although encampments may offer an inexpensive and politically expedient short-term response to the immediate needs of small groups of homeless individuals, those voting for this position articulated that at the end of the day we must never allow ourselves to go to our own homes believing that we have done something good by letting people live in tent cities. Furthermore, several of the individuals in this voting group articulated concerns that encampments can have deleterious impact on the communities in which they are sited, and that placing encampments in communities that do not want them impinge upon the rights and daily lives of our county’s citizens.

Decision Area 2: Should Encampments Be Permitted on Public or Private Lands?

This question proved complex and challenging for the Commission. Voting on this question produced the following perspectives:

Eleven Commissioners voted to support the use of public or private lands for homeless encampments. These Commissioners articulated one specific addendum in relation to the use of public lands:

1. Specific and consistent occupancy standards/criteria must be developed for encampments on public land (including health and safety criteria).

There were many reasons provided for those supporting this position. These included:

- Solving the problem of homelessness will require the involvement of both the public and private sectors. It is unreasonable to place the entire burden of hosting encampments on the private property owners (including churches), when there may be public lands that are suitable for this use.
- Placing encampments on public lands may allow tent cities to remain for longer periods of time at a single location. The Commission heard from many encampment residents that the stability that is critical to finding jobs, sustaining links to needed treatment and supportive services and increasing productive participation in society is compromised when frequent moves are required and one's address changes every month.

The addendum to this position was provided to help insure that the use of public lands for encampments occurs in a careful and measured fashion. Those sponsoring encampments on public lands should be required to meet standards appropriate to the use of publicly-owned property, including criteria designed to promote the health and safety of both the tent city residents and the surrounding community.

Three Commissioners voted to support the use of private lands only for homeless encampments. These Commissioners do not support the use of public lands for homeless encampments under any circumstances.

These Commissioners articulated that any use of public lands for encampments would be inappropriate, in part because governments should not be in the business of making properties it holds for the benefit of all citizens available to small groups for the establishment of tent cities. Furthermore, this group stated that encampments on public lands could prove more difficult to manage; for example, it might be more difficult to evict undesirable residents from an encampment of public versus private lands. Use of public properties might also result in allowing longer encampments in single locations than is healthy either for the tent city residents or the communities that are located nearby.

Three Commissioners voted to not permit the use of either public or private lands for homeless encampments.

Consistent with the reasons articulated in their vote on Decision Area 1, these Commissioners are opposed to allowing public encampments on any lands, public or private, in King County.

Decision Area 3: What should be the policy and procedural guidelines for determining the location of future homeless encampments?

In order to frame discussion and decision-making on this topic area, the CACHE began its deliberations with the 2002 Consent Decree related to homeless encampments developed among the City of Seattle, SHARE/WHEEL and El Centro de la Raza. It is important to note that in order to remain in alignment with the mandate assigned to it by the Council, the Commission addressed *only* those guidelines it deemed relevant to making decisions about the *location* of future homeless encampments. The Commission did not consider policy and procedural guidelines related to the operations and management of homeless encampments. Although many questions related to this issue were raised during the course of the public testimony received and the CACHE deliberations, further discussion and decision making in these areas has been deferred by CACHE to those entities with designated responsibility for these issues.

Policy and Procedural Guidelines Approved by the Commission

After careful consideration and discussion, the CACHE approved the following guidelines. The vote tallies for and against each item are provided below.

Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must secure an agreement to host the encampment in writing from the host property owner. VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

The sponsoring organization shall enter into a written or oral agreement with the host property owner, whether a religious community, school, private entity or public entity, regarding the establishment of a tent encampment. If the agreement is oral, the sponsoring organization shall memorialize the agreement in writing. The written or memorialized agreement shall state the maximum duration the encampment will remain at the host site.

For encampments on public lands, the agreement referenced above shall not be executed prior to formal opportunities for public input. VOTE: 10 yes/7 no

The Commission recognizes that there may be differences between religious institutions and other private organizations hosting homeless encampments and public lands that are approved for this use. A majority of the Commissioners voted to require that, where public lands are being considered for use for encampments, community meetings that ensure mechanisms for public input into the decision be convened prior to the execution of the agreements between the sponsoring and host organizations.

Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must promptly notify the appropriate local government department(s) responsible for land use of the agreement, including cities containing or contiguous to an encampment site. VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

Once the sponsoring organization has entered into a written or oral agreement with a host, the sponsoring organization shall provide a copy of the agreement within three calendar days to whatever local government department(s) is/are designated with oversight of zoning and land use activities. The notice shall identify two contact persons for the sponsoring organization at the host site and two contact persons who are representatives of the host, with daytime and nighttime contact details for all such persons.

Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must notify the local community about the following specifics:

- ***The date encampment will begin***
- ***The length of encampment***
- ***The maximum number of residents allowed***
- ***The host location (planned site of the encampment)***
- ***The date(s), time(s), and location(s) of community meeting(s) about the encampment***

VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

After entering into an oral or written agreement with a host, the sponsoring organization shall set date(s), time(s) and location(s) for community meeting(s).

Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must provide notification to the local community within a specified number of days prior to the start of the encampment:

<i>Require between 5-14 days advance notice:</i>	<i>4 votes</i>
<i>Require between 14-30 days advance notice:</i>	<i>10 votes</i>
<i>Require at least 30 days advance notice:</i>	<i>3 votes</i>

Commissioners had several different perspectives on the number of days prior to the start of an encampment that should be required for community notification. When tent cities are required to move on a regular basis (e.g., every 30 days), it may in some cases be difficult to secure a new location and complete all required notification activities more than 30 days in advance. At the same time, less than one week's notice prior to the arrival of an encampment may not provide local communities and local government entities with sufficient time to prepare for the arrival of so many new neighbors. The position taken by the largest number of Commissioners to require 14-30 days advance notice, represents an effort to find the middle ground that balances the challenges of finding suitable encampment hosts and the need for adequate community notification.

Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must conduct its notification activities in a specified geographic area in proximity to site of encampment:

<i>Two (2) blocks:</i>	<i>10 votes</i>
<i>1,320 feet / 1/4 mile:</i>	<i>7 votes</i>

The most desirable geography of notification may vary, depending on the nature of the host site selected. In a large urban area such as Seattle, providing notification within a two block radius of the encampment may be adequate to the needs of both the community and the tent city. In more suburban or rural areas where the actual concept of neighbor and neighborhood may be defined differently, a larger notification area may be needed. While the votes recorded on this item reflect two different positions, the Commissioners recognized that flexibility may be required, and the specific nature of notification activities may need to vary by encampment location. While a two-block notification may not suffice for a rural encampment, a 1,320 foot notification in a densely populated city may prove unwieldy and costly for the sponsoring organization to complete.

Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must conduct one to two informational meeting for the neighboring community to explain the proposal and respond to questions from local residents about the encampment VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

The sponsoring organization and the host site will hold a community meeting on the encampment site, if reasonable facilities exist, or otherwise at a location a reasonable distance from the host site. The host and sponsoring organization will, at this meeting, explain the proposed encampment and state its proposed duration. Questions and answers will be allowed.

The Commissioners agreed that the number of meetings needed to ensure adequate depends on the nature of the site selected for the encampment. In larger communities, two meetings may be preferred. In smaller communities, one meeting may suffice and two meetings may tax the resources of the sponsoring and host organizations.

Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must comply with limiting the maximum number of residents in any one encampment.

Allow a maximum of 100 persons per encampment: **9 votes**

Allow a maximum of 75 persons per encampment: **8 votes**

All the Commissioners agreed that limiting the size of encampments is critical to maintaining a viable, manageable and safe tent city environment. There was some disagreement about the maximum desired size, as reflected in the vote totals above.

Any encampment must provide suitable buffers from surrounding properties.
VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

Tent encampments shall maintain the following buffers from surrounding lots:

- a) A minimum 20 foot separation or setback in each direction from the boundary of the lot on which the encampment is located, but if not available;
- b) Established vegetation sufficiently dense to obscure view and at least eight feet in height, but if neither a) nor b) is available;
- c) An eight-foot high, view-obscuring fabric fence. This is the least preferred alternative, but may also be used in combination with a) and b).

Any encampment must consider impacts to on-street and on-site parking. VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

On-Street Parking: The availability of on-street parking will be considered in selecting encampment sites if the encampment would displace on-site parking normally utilized by the host. The sponsoring organization shall endeavor not to displace established parking. Host sites shall be selected where no displacement or minimal displacement of parking will occur, when possible.

On-Site Parking: The sponsoring organization shall select potential host sites with available on-site parking for vehicles associated with the encampment, including delivery trucks, whenever possible.

Any encampment must consider impacts to personal and environmental health, and access to human services. Locations must be adequate for carrying out the directives and expectations of Public Health – Seattle & King County. VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

The sponsoring organization will ensure the location of any encampment is appropriate for meeting safe food, water and sanitation practices as defined by Public Health. The sponsoring organization will permit inspections of its encampments by Public Health – Seattle & King County without prior notice. The sponsoring organization shall comply with all directives issued by Public Health within the time period specified by Public Health. In selecting encampment sites, the sponsoring organization will consider linkages to address the human service needs of residents and access to public transportation.

The duration of stay for each encampment must be compatible with climate-related location limitations. VOTE: 17 yes/0 no

Encampments should not remain at a location that, due to weather conditions (such as rain) do not remain viable and healthy locations for tent cities.

The duration of an encampment at any specific location should not exceed three consecutive months at any one time, and not exceed six months in any two-year period. VOTE: 14 yes/3 no

There was some disagreement voiced about this issue, as reflected in the vote tally recorded above. All the Commissioners agreed that an exception to this provision could be made if the site is suitable, the impact of the encampment on the surrounding community is negligible, and/or the community is supportive of continuing the encampment.

King County should identify and specify King County parcels that could potentially be used for homeless encampments. VOTE: 11 yes/3 no

During its deliberations, the Commission requested information on parcels of land held by King County that could potentially be used as sites for homeless encampments. The Commission recommended that such a list, after careful compilation by county staff, be made available to the general public for information and review. CACHE believes that the general public – including both those seeking to sponsor encampments and those concerned about where future encampments might be located – have a right to know of the parcels owned by King County that could potentially be used for such purposes.

Multiple encampments in unincorporated King County should be spaced no less than 25 miles apart from each other. VOTE: 9 yes/6 no/2 abstaining

Many Commissioners expressed concern about the potential impact of multiple encampments on unincorporated areas of the county, especially in smaller communities or regions that are rural in nature. In order to accommodate this concern, a majority of the CACHE Commissioners believes that encampments in unincorporated areas should be separated by significant geographic distance. The 25 mile limit here is not based on any specific information or evidence; rather, the distance listed here is intended to suggest the need for careful consideration of the impact of encampments in less sparsely populated areas of the county.

Policy and Procedural Guidelines Not Approved by the Commission

The following items were considered by the CACHE, but did not receive support of the majority of voting Commissioners. The vote tallies for each item are included below.

Any sponsoring agency shall be required to carry a \$2 million performance bond. VOTE: 3 yes/12 no

Several Commissioners articulated the position that sponsoring agencies should be required to maintain a performance bond for the duration of their sponsorship of a homeless encampment. The majority of the Commission did not agree with this requirement.

Any sponsoring agency shall be required to carry a \$2 million liability insurance policy. VOTE: 3 yes/12 no

Several Commissioners articulated the position that sponsoring agencies should be required to maintain liability insurance for the duration of their sponsorship of a homeless encampment. The majority of the Commission did not agree with this requirement. However, the Commission did vote unanimously to recommend that residents of and visitors to encampments hold King County harmless from liabilities related to encampments. (N.B. This vote was not included in the approved policy and procedural guidelines, above, because it does not pertain to the actual location of homeless encampments.)

A special permitting review board with a recommended composition of three King County Council members, three local elected officials from the area(s) affected by encampments, and three citizens from affected areas, appointed by the local elected officials be established to review and grant permits for homeless encampments.
VOTE: 4 yes/10 no, 1 abstention

Several Commissioners recommended that special permits be required for any homeless encampments, and that special permitting review boards be established in communities where special encampment permits are being sought. A recommended configuration for these permitting review boards was offered. The majority of the Commission did not agree with this recommendation.

Any sponsoring organization should be limited to sponsoring no more than one encampment at any one time in unincorporated King County. VOTE: 4 yes/11 no, 2 abstentions

Several Commissioners expressed concern about the capacity of sponsoring organizations to operate multiple encampments in different locations. Although all the Commissioners agreed that any sponsoring organizations should maintain the capacity to manage homeless encampments effectively, the majority of Commissioners did not want to limit the ability of organizations with the demonstrated capacity to manage more than one encampment a time to be precluded from doing so because of a formal county policy.

Encampments may not occupy host sites until any legally required permits have been obtained. We recognize that court orders may supercede local zoning ordinances.
Vote: 5 yes/11 no, 1 abstaining

The Commissioners discussed the situation facing those locations in which any of a variety of zoning permits may be required in order to host a homeless encampment. Recognizing that the law is already clear about zoning requirements throughout the County, the majority of Commissioners did not perceive that any additional statements about this issue are necessary at this time.

Attachment 1: King County Ordinance 14922

King County

Signature Report

June 17, 2004

Ordinance 14922

Proposed No. 2004-0248.2

Sponsors: Edmonds, Ferguson, Phillips, Constantine, Pelz, Gossett and Patterson

AN ORDINANCE establishing the King County citizens' advisory commission on homeless encampments.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. Establishment - definition. The King County citizens' advisory commission on homeless encampments is hereby established. For the purposes of this ordinance, "the commission" means the King County citizens' advisory commission on homeless encampments.

SECTION 2. Purpose. The commission shall study, identify options and make recommendations to the executive and council on the following issues:

- A. A needs assessment for homeless encampments, including an analysis of homeless shelters in King County and the date and time when demand for shelters have exceeded available space;
- B. Policy and procedural guidelines for determining the location of future homeless encampments;
- C. Options, including an analysis of the potential advantages and disadvantages, for locating homeless encampments on public land in King County; and
- D. Options, including an analysis of the potential advantages and disadvantages, for locating homeless encampments on private land in King County.

SECTION 3. Membership - appointment process, requirements.

A. The commission shall consist of twenty-two members, including eighteen voting members and four advisory members. In accordance with K.C.C. 2.28.002, the members shall be appointed by the executive and confirmed by the council by motion.

B. The eighteen members shall consist of the following:

- 1. Thirteen members who are citizens, each representing one of the thirteen council districts. Of the thirteen citizen members, the executive shall select the appointee representing a council district from a list of names forwarded by the councilmember representing that district to the executive;

2. Two members from community-based organizations, which may include but are not necessarily limited to faith-based organizations, of which at least one member shall reside in a city located in King County with a population less than five hundred thousand;
 3. One member who represents the municipal government of a city located in King County with a population less than five hundred thousand;
 4. One member who represents the city of Seattle; and
 5. One member who represents King County.
- C. The four advisory members shall consist of the following:
1. One member from a human services organization that deals with homeless issues;
 2. One member from a human services organization that deals with housing issues;
 3. One member from the law enforcement community with experience working with homeless encampments; and
 4. One member who is employed by Seattle-King County public health.
- D. All appointees should have:
1. An ability to work with differing viewpoints to find solutions to complex problems; and
 2. A willingness to commit the time necessary to attend commission meetings, public hearings and other activities necessary to complete the purpose of the commission.
- E. An appointee shall not hold or be a candidate for elected office while serving on the commission.
- F. The executive shall transmit to the council the appointments to the commission, including names and contact information of the twenty-two commission members, by June 7, 2004.

SECTION 4. Public hearing requirements. The commission shall hold a minimum of two public hearings at different locations in the county to solicit input from the general public. The public hearings shall be widely advertised in the media and through appropriate existing county distribution lists.

SECTION 5. Recommendations - referral to the committee-of-the-whole. Any policy recommendations issued by the commission that require council approval shall be referred to the committee-of-the-whole for review and consideration.

SECTION 6. Reporting requirements. The commission shall file with the clerk of the council, for distribution to all council members, a final written report by August 15, 2004, including a needs assessment and recommendations on the issues identified in section 2 of this ordinance. Each recommendation shall include justification and reasoning supporting the conclusion.

SECTION 7. Staffing and operations.

- A. The commission shall appoint two members to serve as co-chairs of the body.
- B. The executive shall provide professional staff support to the commission. The executive shall designate staff persons with the appropriate level of expertise and experience necessary to support the commission.
- C. County staff persons in all departments and all branches of government shall be available to answer questions and provide information to the commission.

D. The prosecuting attorney's office shall provide legal assistance to the commission.

SECTION 8. Parking. The county shall provide parking space free of charge in the county garage to commission members while attending meetings where commission business is conducted.

SECTION 9. Locating homeless encampments on county-owned property before adoption of policies. The county shall not identify county-owned property for locating homeless encampments or locate homeless encampments on county-owned property prior to September 15, 2004.

Attachment 2: Members of the King County Citizens Advisory Commission on Homeless Encampments

JUDY SCHNEBELE - Council District 1

Judy Schnebele has an active interest in the issues of homelessness and affordable housing. She is past-president of the board of LATCH, the Lutheran Alliance to Create Housing, and has remained active in fund raising and committees for LATCH. She has participated as a community representative on the board for the Easternwood Cooperative, which is affordable cooperative housing. Judy has been a business owner and is currently an independent contractor. She has lived in the Bothell/Woodinville area for 31 years.

SANDRA KORTUM – Council District 2

Sandra Kortum is an Elder at Lake City Christian Church, which has hosted Tent City three times. She believes strongly in the need to provide safe housing for those who are homeless and trying to work and get back on their feet. She has been a resident of the Lake City/Shoreline area since 1990. She has been employed with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) for 11 years, and has worked for the past four years with developers, citizens and local agencies (cities) in facilitating solutions to issues where there is no clear answer. She has learned to listen and to utilize the expertise of all the parties involved, in order to find solutions that meet the local agencies' needs, the developer or citizen's finances, and the laws that govern WSDOT.

HOLLY PLACKETT – Council District 3 (CACHE Co-Chair)

Holly Plackett is a former Redmond City Council member where she served as chair of the Parks and Human Services Committee and as a member of the Public Administration and Finance Committee. In 2002 she was elected vice-president of the Council. Previously, she served five years on the Redmond Planning Commission, including one year as chair. She is currently a credit analyst with US Bank.

BOB SANTOS – Council District 4

Bob Santos is a longtime citizen activist who has devoted much of his personal and professional life to advocating for affordable housing for low-income individuals and families. He is the former Northwest Representative for the Secretary of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), where he worked to create partnerships across public and private sectors to create affordable and special needs housing projects. He was also responsible for establishing a homeless shelter in the Federal Building in downtown Seattle, creating a precedent for other federal office buildings to open their doors to help the homeless. Santos is currently executive director of Inter*Im Community Development Association, dedicated to promoting and revitalizing the Asian Pacific communities in the Puget Sound area for the benefit of low-moderate income residents and business owners.

AL PATTERSON - Council District 5

Al Patterson is Chaplain for the Tukwila Police and Fire Departments. Prior to becoming a chaplain, he was the Executive Director of Love in the Name of Christ, a non-profit agency that assists the needy in Southwest King County. He also worked 25 years in the aerospace industry as a graphic artist. He has been a Police Department volunteer since 2001 at the Neighborhood Resource Center (NRC). He is a resident of Tukwila and is an ordained minister.

SUSAN G. RYNAS – Council District 6

Susan G. Rynas is a Licensed Mental Health Counselor as well as a passionate advocate for the mentally ill. She and her husband have resided on the Eastside for the past four years and are the parents of two adult daughters. Her interest in homeless issues is subjective and personal, stemming from her life experiences as a family member. She is interested in the varied root causes of homelessness and favors long-term solutions. Susan holds a firm belief that no one should be homeless.

DINI DUCLOS – Council District 7

Dini Duclos is chief executive officer of the Multi-Service Center, a private not for profit community action agency serving low-income individuals and families living in South King County. Dini came to the agency in 1995 and has led the agency to expand its mission to include emergency shelter for homeless families, transitional housing for homeless families and individuals in recovery, and affordable housing for individuals, families and seniors. Today the agency has 180 units of housing and an additional 271 in development stages. Ms. Duclos has served on the Committee to End Homelessness, is board chair for the Federal Way Chamber of Commerce, president-elect of the Statewide Community Action Partnership and a board member of the Housing Development Consortium of Seattle/King County.

PAUL FISCHBURG – Council District 8

Paul Fischburg has been engaged in creating community for over 20 years. He was a founding member and development manager for Puget Ridge Cohousing where he has lived with his family since the project was completed in 1994. Paul was a founder of the Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association (DNDA) and has been the Executive Director since its inception. Since breaking ground on its first project in 1999, DNDA has completed over \$12 million in community development projects in the Delridge community, with over \$27 million in projects under development. In the summer of 2003, Paul returned from a year-long sabbatical during which he, his wife and daughter experienced community life around the world.

RON SWICORD – Council District 9

Ron Swicord has worked in the high tech industry for over 30 years, serving as general manager, vice president of sales, and operations manager. Currently he is program manager for a Fortune 100 company supporting a field sales organization of over 1,200 people throughout the U.S. Mr. Swicord and his wife have lived in the Puget Sound area for 25 years and have three children. He has been involved as fundraising chairman for local non-profit organizations and has raised over \$1

million over the past several years. He supports property rights, encourages citizen involvement in their communities, and favors long-term solutions, which include training, educational assistance and job placement in order to minimize the need for temporary solutions for the homeless.

HARRIETT WALDEN – Council District 10

Rev. Harriet Walden is an associate pastor with the Joy Cathedral in Seattle, where she is actively involved in leading a social justice ministry that includes advocating for the homeless. She is a founding member of Mothers for Police Accountability and worked with the Seattle Police Department to develop Crisis Intervention Training for police officers. Rev. Walden has lived in Seattle for thirty years and is both a mother and grandmother. She is active with the Church Council of Greater Seattle.

STEVEN PYEATT – Council District 11

Steven Pyeatt has been involved in the computer, networking, and Internet industry for over 25 years, and is currently involved in Web hosting and site development. He is a lifetime area resident, born in Shoreline and currently living in Kirkland. Pyeatt is active in community and charitable causes, including chairing fund raising events for the American Cancer Society. He promotes individuals becoming involved in their communities. He is one of the founders of the Communities for Fair Process and played an active role in advocating for due process with regard to homeless encampments. He advocates a comprehensive system that taps the intelligence and education of the smartest region of the country to develop an innovative model for real solutions to end homelessness.

SHANE DAVIES – Council District 12

Shane Davies is a lifelong resident of King County, living just outside Maple Valley. He is a realtor for Windermere Real Estate and currently manages the Maple Valley office, which he opened in 2000. He also spent six years in the US Naval Reserves. Davies has worked with the Windermere Foundation, which uses its funds to help homeless and low-income families. He also volunteers with a local housing charity, Vine Maple Place. He is a member of the Maple Valley/Black Diamond Chamber of Commerce and Rotary.

ROBERT THOMPSON, MD – Council District 13

Dr. Robert Thompson is a physician whose primary area of practice is family medicine, with a secondary practice in obstetrics/gynecology. He is affiliated with Valley Medical Center in Renton.

WILLIAM KIRLIN-HACKETT – Faith-based organization (CACHE Co-Chair)

Bill Kirlin-Hackett resides in Redmond and is an ordained Lutheran (ELCA) minister. His home congregation is St. Luke's Lutheran Church in Bellevue. He is Program Coordinator for the Interfaith Task Force on Homelessness, and also serves as one of the coordinating leaders of the Religious Leaders' Task Force of the King County Alliance for Human Services. In addition, he serves on the Advisory Board for the Rauschenbusch Center for Spirit and Action.

TONY LEE – Community-based organization

Tony Lee is Advocacy Director for the Fremont Public Association and Policy Director for the Statewide Poverty Action Network (SPAN). He is responsible for directing advocacy work for both FPA and SPAN, focusing on low-income issues such as welfare reform, GAU, Medicaid and low-income housing. Previously he served as Legislative Director for the Washington Association of Churches where he coordinated public policy work and focused on human rights and low-income issues. He was also previously a staff attorney with Evergreen Legal Services.

RHONDA BERRY – Suburban city representative

Rhonda Berry is City Administrator of the City of Tukwila. She has been with the City nearly 14 years, having served under 3 Mayors. The City's Human Services Division was created under Rhonda's supervision some 13 years ago. Rhonda has served on the Board of Directors of Southeast Seattle Senior Foundation and Emerald City Outreach Ministries, is a volunteer tutor in the Tukwila schools, and has been involved in various community activities.

ALAN PAINTER – City of Seattle

Alan Painter is Director of the Community Services Division of the City of Seattle's Human Services Department. He is responsible for coordinating and implementing City policy initiatives to support housing and services on behalf of homeless persons. He chaired the Governor's Washington State Advisory Council on Homelessness and co-chaired the Washington State Policy Academy on Homeless Families. Previously, Alan worked for US Congressman Mike Lowry as director of Lowry's District Office and also worked as a Special Assistant to US Senator Warren G. Magnuson in Washington, D.C. Alan is a Seattle native.

DOUG STEVENSON – King County

Doug Stevenson is the lead staff for the King County Council's Law, Justice and Human Services Committee and previously served as the Manager of the county's Human Services Division. In these roles he has worked on the development of housing and treatment programs for persons disabled by mental illness, substance abuse or developmental disabilities. He has also worked on improving the connections between treatment and the criminal justice system as part of recent county reforms in the juvenile and adult justice systems. Mr. Stevenson is also a member of the board of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill - Greater Seattle Chapter.

Advisory Members:**BILL HOBSON – Human services organization, homeless services**

Bill Hobson is Executive Director of the Downtown Emergency Service Center. DESC is a nationally recognized agency that assists homeless men and women with major mental disorders, addictive illnesses and other significant vulnerabilities by providing a comprehensive continuum of care including emergency shelter, clinical services (street outreach and engagement, case management, crisis respite, chemical dependency treatment) and long-term supportive housing. Bill serves on several homeless

committees including the Washington State Policy Academy on Chronic Homelessness and the Seattle/King County Coalition for the Homeless.

LINDA WEEDMAN – Human services organization, housing

Linda Weedman is Senior Director for Housing and Related Services for the YWCA of Seattle, King County, and Snohomish County. In that capacity she oversees all YWCA housing, transitional housing, homeless and domestic violence services, which are located in ten suburban cities and unincorporated King County. With 20 years of housing and management experience she was formerly the Director of Resident Services for the King County Housing Authority.

CARL COLE – Law enforcement

Carl Cole is a Captain in the King County Sheriff's Office in Shoreline. He has been a commissioned officer of the Sheriff's Office for 12 years. Capt. Cole has served in various assignments including patrol, investigations, administration, and training. He is currently the Operations Commander for the City of Shoreline Police Department, responsible for all functions relevant to delivering police services to the Shoreline community.

JANNA WILSON – Public Health Seattle-King County

Janna Wilson is program manager of the Health Care for the Homeless Network, which organizes health outreach services for people who are homeless in Seattle and King County. The network provides on-site services and technical assistance at over 60 homeless agencies and serves over 8,000 people who are homeless a year. Janna also serves as a board member on the National Health Care for the Homeless Council. Previously, Janna worked with the King County Council to develop the *Framework Policies for Human Services* and also served as Homeless Continuum of Care planner for the Department of Community and Human Services from 1994-99.

Attachment 3: King County Staff Who Provided Assistance to CACHE

King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS)

- Jackie MacLean, Director
- Patrick Vanzo, Administrator, Cross Systems Integration Efforts, Director's Office
- Sherry Hamilton, Communications Manager, Director's Office
- Carole Antoncich, Coordinator, Homeless Housing Programs, Community Services Division (CSD)
- Kate Speltz, Homeless Planner, Homeless Housing Programs, CSD
- Janice Hougen, Planner II, Homeless Housing Programs, CSD
- Ellie McKinley, Confidential Secretary, Director's Office

King County Prosecuting Attorney

- Sally Bagshaw, Chief Deputy, Civil Division, Office of the Prosecuting Attorney
- John Briggs, Staff, Civil Division, Office of the Prosecuting Attorney

King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks

- Bob Burns, Deputy Director

Attachment 4 -- CACHE Votes by Commissioner

Commission Member	Vote #1	Vote #2	Vote #3	Vote # 4*	Vote #5	Vote #6	Vote #7	Vote #8	Vote #9	Vote #10	Vote #11	Vote #12	Vote #13	Vote #14	Vote #15	Vote #16*	Vote #17*
Berry, Rhonda	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	2 blocks	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Davies, Shane	no	neither	Yes		Yes	Yes	30	.25 miles	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Duclos, Dini	no	private	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	2 blocks	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Fischburg, Paul	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	.25 miles	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Kirlin-Hackett, Bill	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	5-14	2 blocks	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Kortum, Sandra	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	.25 miles	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Lee, Tony	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	2 blocks	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Painter, Alan	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	2 blocks	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Patterson, Al	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	2 blocks	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Plackett, Holly	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	.25 miles	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Pyeatt, Steven	no	neither	Yes		Yes	Yes	30	.25 miles	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Rynas, Susan	yes	private	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	.25 miles	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Santos, Bob	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	5-14	2 blocks	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Schnebele, Judy	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	5-14	2 blocks	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Stevenson, Doug																	
Swicord, Ron	no	neither	Yes		Yes	Yes	30	.25 miles	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Thompson, Robert	yes	both	Yes		Yes	Yes	5-14	2 blocks	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Walden, Harriett	yes	private	Yes		Yes	Yes	14-30	2 blocks	Yes	75	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

* Roll-call votes are not available for these decision areas.

- Vote number 1:** **Is there a need for homeless encampments?**
- Vote number 2:** **Should encampments be permitted on public or private lands?**
Both = permitted on both public and private land
Neither = not permitted on public or private land
Private = permitted only on private land
- Vote number 3:** **Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must secure an agreement to host the encampment in writing from the host property owner.**
- Vote number 4:** **For encampments on public lands, the agreement referenced above shall not be executed prior to formal opportunities for public input. Vote is recorded as 10-7 – Roll-call vote not available.**
- Vote number 5:** **Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must promptly notify the appropriate local government department(s) responsible for land use of the agreement, including cities containing or contiguous to an encampment site.**
- Vote number 6:** **Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must notify the local community about the following specifics:**
 - **Date encampment will begin**
 - **Length of encampment**
 - **Maximum number of residents allowed**
 - **The host location (planned site of the encampment)**
 - **The date(s), time(s), and location(s) of community meeting(s) about the encampment.**
- Vote number 7:** **Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must provide notification to the community within a specified number of days prior to the start of the encampment:**
5-14 days notification
14-30 days notification
At least 30 days advance notification
- Vote number 8:** **Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must conduct its notification activities in a specified geographic area in proximity to site of encampment:**
2 blocks
1.320 feet (1/4 mile)

- Vote number 9:** Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must conduct one to two informational meetings for the neighboring community to explain the proposal and respond to questions from local residents about the encampment.
- Vote number 10:** Any organization sponsoring a homeless encampment must comply with limiting the maximum number of residents in any one encampment.
Maximum of 100 persons
Maximum of 75 persons
- Vote number 11:** Any encampment must provide suitable buffers from surrounding properties.
- Vote number 12:** Any encampment must consider impacts to on and off-site parking.
- Vote number 13:** Any encampment must consider impacts to personal and environmental health, and access to human services. Locations must be adequate for carrying out the directives and expectations of Public Health – Seattle and King County.
- Vote number 14:** The duration for each encampment must be compatible with climate-related local limitations.
- Vote number 15:** The duration of an encampment should not exceed three consecutive months, and not exceed six months in any two year period.
(Note: All the Commissioners agreed that an exception could be made if the site is suitable, the impact of the encampment on the surrounding community is negligible, and/or the community is supportive of continuing the encampment.)
- Vote number 16:** King County should identify and specify King County parcels that could potentially be used for homeless encampments. Vote recorded as 11-3 – Roll-call vote not available.
- Vote number 17:** Multiple encampments in unincorporated King County should be spaced no less than 25 miles apart from each other. Vote recorded as 9 yes/6 no/2 abstaining – Role-call vote not available.